

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMME United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR FILING DATE 10/621,888 07/16/2003 Dennis N. Bingham LIT-Pi-402A.D1.C1.D1 3067 EXAMINER 7590 08/24/2004 Stephen R. Christian HARRIS, KATRINA B BBWI ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER PO BOX 1625 IDAHO FALLS, ID 83415-3899 3747

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
055	10/621,888	BINGHAM ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Katrina B. Harris	3747
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wit	th the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RETHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, and if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stany reply received by the Office later than three months after the meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DN. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re t. a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty briod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT tatute, cause the application to become ABA	eply be timely filed  (30) days will be considered timely.  THS from the mailing date of this communication.  ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1	6 July 2003	
· · · · -	This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	drawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor		• •
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Bur * See the attached detailed Office action for a	ents have been received. ents have been received in Ap priority documents have been r reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	plication No eceived in this National Stage
Attachment(s)	,	
I) ⊠ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) ☑ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) L Interview Su	mmary (PTO-413) /Mail Date
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>07/16/04</u> .		ormal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Art Unit: 3747

### **DETAILED ACTION**

The following is a first action on the merits of application serial no. 10/621,888 filed July 16, 2003.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

## **Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,619,273 and claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,494,191. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the method set forth is inherently performed by the

apparatus claimed in the patent such that normal use of the apparatus would infringe method claims 1 and 5.

Claims 2-4 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,619,273 and claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,494,191, respectively, as stated above and further in view of Ishikawa et al (4,483,303). It would further had been obvious to selected from a group including propane and butane as taught by Ishikawa et al. to provide a suitable fuel for operating the engine.

### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. .U.S. Patent No. 5,542,398 issued to Marcon is a similar system. U.S. Patent No. 5,678,524 issued to Ofner et al. is a similar valve having two chambers.

## Communication

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Katrina B. Harris whose telephone number is 703-308-8323. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00 AM -2:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Henry Yuen can be reached on 703-308-1946. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/621,888 Page 4

Art Unit: 3747

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KRAL

Andrew M. Dolinar Primary Examiner

duly D. O.